<div align="center">

CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES
January 24, 2:35 p.m.—4:35 p.m.

</div>

MEMBERS PRESENT

President	James Carranza
Vice President	David Laderman
Treasurer	Rosemary Nurre
Secretary Pro Tem	Lee Miller
Business/Technology	Lilya Vorobey
Creative Arts/Social Science	Jim Robertson
Language Arts	Teeka James
Language Arts	Tim Maxwell
Math/Science	Daryrl Stanford
Physical Education/Athletics	Larry Owens
Student Services	Kevin Sinarle
Committee on Instruction	Teresa Morris

MEMBERS ABSENT

Past President	Diana Bennett
Business/Technology	Darryl Dorsett
Math/Science	Tania Beliz
Student Services	Jacqueline Gamelin
Student Learning Outcomes	David Locke

OTHERS ATTENDING
Paige Kupperberg, ASCSM
Steven King, Student Assistant

Agenda: Approved with the following additions:
- Update on plus/minus grading pilot program
- Extending regularly scheduled meeting time until 4:30 rather than 4:00, to conform to current practice.

Minutes:
Approved by unanimous consent.

Information items:
Teresa Morris reminded faculty that textbooks can be put on reserve in library.

ASCSM report: Paige Kupperberg
Chinese New Year's celebration in quad tomorrow; next week, Reboot Week, activities in quad. Planning is beginning for March in March.

President's Report
Not much to report about IPC and College Council. Will be discussions of transfer issues at upcoming meetings.

Measure G Funds
Discussion ensued about how Measure G funds are used. Teeka James expressed concerns that the decisions weren't sufficiently faculty-driven. One example was failure to consider replacement of inoperable and obsolete computers in drafting lab, which is not on the list of labs to be considered for equipment requests. President agreed to place this on the agenda for the next meeting.

Program Review
Discussion of how to get more faculty input into how the program review process can be improved. Very few surveys returned. Suggestions included:
- After completing program review, faculty members could be invited to participate in lunch and a focus group.
- Provide evidence to faculty that the reports are actually being read by providing a response from administrators to the program reviews.
- Incorporate survey questions into the program review based on the theory that faculty would answer questions that are part of the review. Such survey questions would appear at the end of the program review.

Student Success Task Force
Recommendations approved by Board of Governors and will be sent to Legislature.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Basic Skills Initiative: James Carranza
Funding ½ of Learning Center Coordinator position, $47,000/year, for one year.

Lorena del Mundo, BSI coordinator, resigned to take another position. Discussing whether to hire a new coordinator to replace her. Maybe instead get one or two professional development coordinators.

College Assessment Committee:
David Locke absent. James Carranza presented his written report. Seeking ways to automate process of student input regarding SLO assessment of programs.

Committee on Instruction
Teresa Morris left early and was absent. James Carranza announced that next meeting, to finish up course outlines for Humanities courses, is scheduled for Thursday1/26.

ACTION ITEMS

Faculty selection process for Art on Campus Committee
Authors of document not present and discussion ensued in their absence:
- Period missing at end of mission statement.
- Qualifications missing. Speculation that this is because they would be added on a case-by-case basis, depending on the particular issue that the committee will be addressing.
- Document seems to contain conflicting language about whether this will be a permanent committee or an ad hoc committee.
- The consensus was that the proposal was vague and confusing and the purpose of it was unclear. It will be sent back to the authors for clarification.
- Jim Robertson proposed that ASGC adopt a short statement in place of the proposed document:

> For the purpose of discussing the acquisition and siting of art on campus, the Academic Senate Governing Council shall appoint a committee broadly representative of the College community, composed of members with experience at and commitment to the College of San Mateo.

Jim Robertson also suggests that By-Laws be amended to include the Art on Campus as an ad-hoc or occasional committee.

Program Review SLOs, Sec. II, inclusion of degrees and certificates
Sec. b & c should end in periods, not question marks. Approved, as amended, by unanimous consent.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

ASGC meeting time
No objections to changing the ASGC meeting time to 2:30-4:30 p.m. Will be placed on agenda as an action item for next meeting.

Program Review Form, IV Students Success Evaluation and Analysis
No objections to proposed revisions to form.

Many questions were raised about how the program review process can be improved:
- Should we consider redrafting the forms to better serve the needs of faculty?
- How does implementation of CurricUNET affect this?
- How will changes affect needs of accreditation?
- How can process be automated (maybe auto-fill some of data without requiring faculty to actually type it in)?
- What sorts of data do we actually want?

- Which classes should be included in the statistical averages within a discipline?
- Can we tailor statistics to specific needs of department?
- Can we get the raw data to work with?

Jim Robertson cautioned that many faculty may not want more data, because not all of us have a lot of expertise in data analysis or want to be responsible for all the extra work this would entail. Might be helpful, thought, to learn how many of our students got A's in ENGL 100, etc.

James Carranza suggested that faculty can find out whatever data they want. All data that all people want to see doesn't necessarily need to be included in all program reviews.

James Carranza suggested that the current forms could be refined to be shorter and easier to complete. They were drafted under great time pressure and can be improved if thought is put into it.

Purpose of program review:
- Used by CSM administration to evaluate position requests and equipment requests.
- Some items are included because they required for accreditation purposes.
- Other items are included to provide information that is helpful for faculty.

Teeka James suggested that distance education, day and evening classes be compared in separate cohorts, not all at once.

What are the data that matter for decisions by administrators, and do faculty have access to all such data?

Annual program reviews focus on position and equipment requests. Maybe these issues could be separated out and faculty can otherwise complete comprehensive program reviews every three years.

Labs and centers are now better defined to facilitate the process of program review.

Discussed the possibility of students swiping ID cards to document attendance at labs, rather than entering G numbers.

Discussion of whether it would be possible for students to get credit for TBA at different labs, regardless of discipline. But would violate state mandate that student needs to be in line of sight of discipline expert. This is not the case for Learning Center, for example.

Professional Development and Faculty Community Building
James Carranza proposed that the first two hours of a mid-semester Flex Day should be devoted to activities that allow faculty to meet and interact with faculty members whom they don't know. The second two hours could be for ten-minute break-out sessions of some sort to help faculty to become more acquainted with one other. Last semester, ASGC agreed to organize an ASGC reception for transferring students. Kathy Diamond had suggested that faculty could be arranged in a seating arrangement according to the students they have in common, allowing them to meet and interact with one another. Discussion of Flex Day options and Transfer Reception to be continued.